

Amount sanctioned to the Bidar Division under Rural Communication Programme.

*Q.—708. Sri PRABHURAO JAGADALE (Santapur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

the amount that has been sanctioned to the Bidar Division during last four

years for construction of small roads under the Rural Communication Programme, the amount spent and the amount lapsed ?

A —Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).

Vide Statement given below.

Statement showing the amount sanctioned to the Bidar Division for Rural Communication during 1958-1959 to 1961-62.

| Sl. No. | Year | Rural Communication | | Missing Links and Cross Drainage Works. | | Total Rural Communication. | | | |
|---------|---------|---------------------|----------|---|--------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|
| | | Grant | Outlay | Grant | Outlay | Grand Total | Grand Total outlay | Excess | Laps |
| | | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | 1958-59 | ... | ... | ... | ... | Nil | Nil | ... | ... |
| 2 | 1959-60 | 52,600 | 18,225 | 25,000 | 5,236 | 77,600 | 23,461 | ... | 44,139 |
| 3 | 1960-61 | 50,000 | 61,332 | 1,40,000 | 32,437 | 1,90,000 | 93,769 | ... | 96,231 |
| 4 | 1961-62 | 50,000 | 50,527 | 10,000 | 24,221 | 60,000 | 74,739 | 14,739 | ... |
| Total | | 1,52,600 | 1,30,084 | 1,74,000 | 61,825 | 3,27,600 | 1,91,969 | 14,739 | 1,40,370 |

Member's Representation

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಗೂಳಿ).—ನೆನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಕೋರಾರ ಚನ್ನದ ಗಣಿಯ ಘಟನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರ ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರವಾದುದರಿಂದ, ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ದಯೆಯಿಟ್ಟು ಆ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯ ಮೂಲಕ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ವಿದ್ಯಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Was there any agreement of that type ? Ultimately, what I said was that in view of the fact that the Analyser's report has not come, Govt. might consider, before we disperse on the 27th, giving some information, if possible.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Government is trying to

collect the latest information. If it is available it will be placed before the Members before we disperse.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, we on this side have made it clear that this is an urgent matter of public importance. Yesterday, you ruled out the adjournment motion and we had to restrain our feelings because of your ruling. Even now, if the Government does not come forward with the statement, they are certainly ignoring the wishes expressed by the Hon'ble Members on the floor of the House. I therefore call upon the Government through you, Sir, to make statement before this House to-day itself. They should have made it three days back. The reports vary in regard to the number of deaths. The Government has not supplied the exact figure.

(SRI S. SIVAPPA)

Only after the statement is made we will know what has happened there.

STATEMENT OF THE HON'BLE MINISTER FOR HOME

re: **Cases of Deaths in K. G. F.**

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home).—If the Hon'ble Speaker permits me, I will make a statement today just now.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Sir, as regards the Chemical Analyser's report, it is detected that ethyl and methyle alcohol was present in the contents of the stomach. It is further detected that no other poison was there. These two types of alcohols are meant for sale openly and they have caused it. The Government is not at all in the wrong either in taking action or in detecting the crime. If at all there is any responsibility, that responsibility rests with those who misused these two types of alcohol.

In this connection, I wish to submit comparative statistics. During the first week of August 1961 there were 16 cases of deaths during the first week of August 1962, the number was 27 cases of deaths. That means, in that locality or in that area, so many have died. Whether the deaths are due to natural causes or due to any other cause, we have to find out. If there are certain deaths on a certain particular date and that too, all of a sudden that is a matter for consideration. When we consider the normal state of affairs in that locality, we have to take into consideration the comparative figures in the corresponding period of each year.

| Period | Number of cases | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----|
| Second week of August | 61 | 29 |
| „ | 62 | 18 |
| Third week of | 61 | 23 |
| „ | 62 | 27 |
| Fourth week of | 61 | 76 |
| „ | 62 | 30 |

| Period | Number of cases | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|----|
| First week of September | 61 | 43 |
| „ | 62 | 21 |
| Second week of | 61 | 31 |
| „ | 62 | 26 |
| Third week of | 61 | 11 |
| „ | 62 | 20 |

These statistics are furnished by the Sanitary Board.

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL (Kolar).—Does it include the Mining Area also?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Yes, certainly Robertsonpet and K. G. F. If there is a Sanitary Board functioning, then we shall have to rely on the report of that Board. I think the Hon'ble Member is one of the members of that Board.

Sri S. RAJAGOPAL.—That is why I asked for clarification.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Four persons died. As regards people who were prosecuted, prosecutions have been launched in 7 cases.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—How many deaths; only four?

Sri R. M. PATIL.—Four deaths have been detected as per Chemical Examiner's report. In all there are 18 cases of deaths. All those are reported and some of them have been registered. This is all the information. As regards the action taken by the Police authorities, immediately when the patient was admitted in the hospital, the doctor examined that patient and he reported to the Police. The Police rushed to the spot and got the bodies removed and post-mortem was held and the in-patients were examined and treated. Some of them survived and they have made a statement. But, looking to the state of affairs, I do not understand the propriety in saying that this is of public importance, public importance in the sense that it is not at all concerned with the action of the Police.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—You were pleased to give a ruling. You conceded the point that this is of public importance. Now the Hon'ble Minister is trying to question that. He questions the propriety of holding it as of public importance.